

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990)
Interim United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)
Chief, Criminal Division

JULIE A. ARBUCKLE (CSBN 193425)
Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7102
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
E-mail: julie.arbuckle@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CR No. 07-0102 PJH
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
)	EXCLUDING TIME
JOSE GUADALUPE ANGUIANO-)	
GONZALEZ,)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

On April 4, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from April 4, 2007 to April 25, 2007 for effective preparation of defense counsel in that he needs additional information regarding defendant's mental competency, and whether any proceeding to determine defendant's mental competency is appropriate. Additionally, the parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B). The parties also agreed that the ends

1 of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and
2 the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

3 SO STIPULATED:

4
5 SCOTT N. SCHOOLS
United States Attorney

6 DATED: April 4, 2007

7 /s/
JULIE A. ARBUCKLE
Assistant United States Attorney

8
9 DATED: April 4, 2007

10 /s/
JOSH COHEN
Attorney for Defendant Jose Anguiano-Gonzalez

11
12 As the Court found on April 4, 2007, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that
13 the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the
14 defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act
15 calculations from April 4, 2007 to April 25, 2007 for effective preparation of defense counsel.
16 See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny counsel
17 reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due
18 diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B).

19
20 SO ORDERED.

21
22 DATED: 4/9/07

